

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1970

January 5, 1970

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 5, 1970" (1970). *Minutes*. 415.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/415

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Proceedings of January 5, 1970

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hattabaugh, Palmer, Green, Read, Holley, Gover, Whitlow, Hieronymus, Spaniol, Tingley, Crane, Kluge, Keiser, Lahey, McCabe.

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

The minutes of December 15, 1969, were approved as published.

REPORTS:

- A. Mr. Roger Whitlow, chairman of the Nominations and Elections Committee, reported that Mr. Paul Mausel had accepted appointment to the Library Advisory Committee. Mr. Whitlow also presented his committee's proposal for nominations and election procedures for elected university councils. After several minor changes were made it was moved (Read) and seconded (Green) that the committee's recommendation be adopted by the Senate and implemented this year. The motion passed by a vote of eleven in favor and two abstentions. The report as adopted is as follows:

Nominations and Elections Procedures for Elected University Councils

Each Spring Quarter the Faculty Senate shall conduct elections for membership on the Council of Faculties, Faculty Senate, Personnel Committee, Council on Academic Affairs, Council on Teacher Education, Council on Graduate Studies, and the two Interview Committees. For convenience, all the above are designated hereafter as Councils. Uniform procedures shall be followed in elections to the various Councils, with exceptions only where necessitated by special eligibility requirements.

The petition method for nomination shall be used for all Councils. By the twentieth class day of the Winter Quarter all faculty shall receive from the Faculty Senate an explanation of nomination and election eligibility requirements and instructions for submitting nomination petitions. To be nominated for membership on a Council, a faculty member must submit--or have submitted for him--an individual petition containing the signatures of twenty eligible faculty (except in the case of area representative nominations for the Council on Teacher Education, where ten signatures are required.) All petitions must be received by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate no later than the fortieth class day of Winter Quarter. In the event that a minimum of two nominees for each available Council position is not met by the petition method, the Faculty Senate will by a majority vote nominate a sufficient number of additional candidates to meet that minimum. A faculty member who accepts nomination for one major Council (other than the Council of Faculties) shall be ineligible for nomination to any other Council for that election. Current members of major Councils shall not be eligible for nomination to any other Council unless their terms expire with the forthcoming election.

The required number of nominees having accepted nomination, a complete list of candidates shall be distributed to all eligible voters not later than the

twentieth class^{day} of the Spring Quarter, along with announcement of a date for the elections, to be held not later than the twenty-fifth class day of the Spring Quarter. Balloting shall be at a central polling place, on a single date, with ballots to be machine processable with names in alphabetical order. Voters anticipating absence from campus on election day may arrange with the Elections Committee to vote before election day.

Elections shall require a simple majority of those voting. When the number of candidates receiving a majority is insufficient to fill the positions open, a run-off election shall be conducted. Ballots for a run-off election shall list twice as many candidates as there are positions still unfilled for each Council, the list of candidates to be those not yet elected but otherwise with the highest number of votes in the first election. Lists in alphabetical order of elected members and of candidates eligible for any run-off election shall be distributed to all faculty not more than six class days after the first election day, along with announcement of a date for the run-off election, to be held not later than the thirty-seventh class day of the Quarter.

The run-off election shall be conducted exactly as is the original election, except that candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be considered elected, with or without a majority of those voting. Complete membership lists of all Councils shall be published in the minutes of the next Faculty Senate meeting after any run-off election. Newly elected members shall take office at the next meeting of the respective Councils after publication of the new membership lists.

To carry out the procedures above, the Faculty Senate shall name two standing committees, the Nominations Committee and the Elections Committee, with one member serving on both committees and acting as coordinator for the two. The Nominations Committee shall present to the Senate the additional nominations necessary to insure that the minimum of two candidates for each Council vacancy has been met, and shall upon request present to the Executive Committee of the Senate slates of nominees to all University boards, committees, councils, or other organizations for which the Senate appoints or nominates members.

The Elections Committee shall plan for, announce, and conduct the elections and, if needed, any run-off elections; shall be responsible, under direction of the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, for judging ballots and for determining and announcing winning candidates; and shall determine for each elective Council, according to the number of votes received and under direction of the Chairman of the Senate, alternates to take office in the event of any elective Council vacancy during the period until the next election for the position requiring the alternate member.

In all matters of nominations, elections or replacements, questions of interpretation or uncertainty shall be resolved by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate together with the chairmen of the Nominations Committee and the Elections Committee, with such interpretation to be recorded by the secretary for consistency in future elections. All ties shall be resolved by lot.

- B. Miss Hieronymus reported that the Executive Committee had assigned the following agenda items to Committees of the Senate with the hope of expediting action on them. (See minutes of June 18 for committee membership.) The Budget Committee (Mr. Kluge has replaced Mrs. Sparks) was asked to consider the eleven-and-one-half month contract proposal, the sabbatical leave proposal, and the matter of evaluation of faculty research projects. The Buildings and Grounds Committee was requested to prepare a recommendation on the local policy for campus disorders. The Nominations and Elections Committee was assigned the suggestion to create a grievance committee. The Executive Committee will report on the subjects of the proposal for a university government, the budget for higher education, and the policy statements of the Higher Board. A new committee, the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations, was created with Messrs. Palmer (chairman), McCabe, and Hattabaugh as members. The new committee was asked to consider the several proposals for student evaluation of teaching. It was suggested that the agenda item concerning the creation of a Faculty News Sheet might be partially solved if the Senate minutes were changed to proceedings and that more actual debate and longer portions of correspondence be included. The hope was to increase the opportunity for dialogue among the faculty on matters of university-wide concern. It was moved (Gover) and seconded (Crane) that the Senate minutes be changed to proceedings and that more debate and correspondence be included. The motion passed unanimously.

Miss Hieronymus also asked for opinions from the Senate on two matters to be discussed by the President's Advisory Council. The first concerned the proposal to relocate and remodel the Student Services Building. At this point a letter from Mr. Carl Greeson, student body president, was circulated. He writes that the three reasons presented by the President in support of the proposal (to provide space for the data processing center, to provide space for a high rise building immediately north of the Union, and to increase the aesthetic appeal) seemed inadequate to the Student Senate and it intended to continue to oppose the proposal as it now stands. In the ensuing discussion it was agreed that specific information on the proposal and alternatives was uncertain and speculative. It was pointed out that the building weighs one billion pounds. Discussion of the second matter, student participation in university government, was deferred.

- C. The minutes of the meeting of the Council of Administrative Officers of December 11, 1969, were circulated. Mr. McCabe commented that after some discussion the Council agreed that a ticket office in the Union should be established as soon as means of financing can be found. It was also noted that there may no longer be summer music camps on Eastern's campus, the first in the state to have them, because of the expense involved.
- D. The minutes of the meeting of the Council of Instructional Officers of December 18, 1969, were circulated. The following discussion of the Senate's recommendations for faculty evaluation was of particular interest:

The main purpose of the meeting was a discussion of the "Recommendations for Faculty Evaluation" which appeared in the July 9, 1969, minutes of the Faculty Senate.

In general, the attitude of the group toward the recommendations was favorable. Members felt that they were not sufficiently specific to permit anything more definite than general reactions. In this connection, the following observations seem worth mentioning:

Recommendation 1, of the considerations on which academic advancement should be based, teaching competence clearly should come first, and explicit ways of measuring such competence should be spelled out. In this connection, the members are encouraged by the apparent willingness of the Senate to involve the Personnel Committee and the Student Senate in the preparation of evaluation criteria.

Recommendation 2, the members are in hearty agreement. The discussion at this point centered on the means by which the departmental "personnel committee" should be named--by election or by appointment. The relatively vast differences in sizes of departments also injects a problem here. Some departments have 30, 40 or more faculty, while some have 5 or 6. Some departments could not field "a representative group of faculty with three or more years of experience at Eastern."

The size of the committee is rather important, since a Personnel Committee involving several persons might become cumbersome while trying to evaluate the members of the committee, themselves, and preserve confidentiality. It developed that some departments already have personnel committees, while, in others, the department head's signature on a recommendation sheet merely implies "consultation with senior staff members . . ."

Recommendation 3: Because this was the longest and a rather explicit paragraph in the Senate's statement, the members were concerned that this not be construed as the main thrust of the Senate statement. Considerable time was given to a discussion of the dual role of the department head--as instructional officer and as administrator, and how he could best be evaluated. His is a demanding role, one that can hardly be evaluated by his faculty alone. Further, some decisions need to be made about whether the person is, in fact, to be a Dept. Head or merely Chairman of the Department.

Recommendation 4: Members of the Council endorse the idea that when a teacher joins the University he is assumed to be a competent, professional teacher. However, the members also recognize that a new member is on probation, and he should prove the validity of the original assumption before he is granted tenure. The members of the Council feel that department heads and senior staff members should be so cognizant of the abilities and performance of new staff members that they will help them early in preventing mistakes and complaints rather than waiting for complaints and then attempting correction. The mere lack of adverse comment or complaint

could result in tenure of the mediocre by default.

Beyond these general observations, the members of the Council felt nothing more specific should be attempted until the Senate and the Personnel Committee present a concrete proposal.

It was noted that in regard to the CIO's response to recommendation 3, evaluation of department heads, that the Senate did not suggest that the "faculty alone" evaluate department heads, but that it was concerned that no evaluation of department heads by faculty takes place now.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- A. From the Student Senate, the minutes of its meeting of December 11, 1969. Received and circulated.
- B. From President Doudna, a memorandum which reads as follows: "I think things can be worked out so that there is no essential conflict with regard to the matter of a successor for Vice President Zeigel or a reorganization."
- C. From Mr. Ken Midkiff, a letter covering a general proposal for faculty evaluation by students. The letter was referred to the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations.
- D. From Mr. John Buenker, Chairman of the Council on Faculty Research, a copy of the Council's report for Fall Quarter, 1969. The report is as follows:

Council on Faculty Research
Report for Fall Quarter, 1969

The Council began the Fall Quarter with \$28,807.90 in funds. It received ten requests for grants totaling \$24,297.50. Due to the shortage of funds available, it was necessary to pare down the requests in the manner listed below:

<u>Researcher</u>	<u>Amount Requested</u>	<u>Amount Granted</u>
Charles B. Arzeni	\$4,700.00	\$2,677.50
Yung Ping Chen	413.50	255.85
Leonard Durham	2,735.00	1,772.25
Carl K. Green	2,347.00	1,144.95
Richard L. Keiter	3,930.00	2,320.50
Edward O. Moll	3,420.00	2,057.00
Richard L. Smith	2,085.00	1,687.25
William A. Weiler	4,450.00	2,805.00
Mary Rogers	847.00	Total Request
		Disallowed
David Ahlstrom	-----	Withdrew Request
		Because Available
		Funds Not Sufficient

Total Requested: \$24,297.50

Total Granted: \$14,720.30

Current Balance: \$13,087.60

- E. From Mr. William J. Crane, a letter outlining his response to the proposed Faculty Senate Constitution. The letter, as were all others on the same general subject, was referred to the Constitution Committee for specific action.
- F. From Vice President Schaefer, a copy of a letter in answer to observations made by Mr. Daniel J. Koenig on the Long-Range Plan.
- G. From the Retirement Board, the minutes of its meeting of November 8, 1969. Referred to Mr. Crane for analysis and possible comment.
- H. From Mr. Carl Greeson, a letter referred to above in Reports, B, concerning the opposition of the Student Senate to the proposal for remodeling and relocating the Student Services (Practical Arts) Building and requesting the support of the Faculty Senate in the matter. No additional discussion was held.
- I. From Mr. Byron Munson, a copy of a letter to Mr. Ken Midkiff, in response to the latter's proposal for student evaluation of faculty. The letter reads in part as follows:

Many instructors use the shock effect in a deliberate attempt to destroy popular misconceptions. Although this method may be quite effective when properly used, it may have insidious effects on the instructor's image.

Certain instructors stimulate and challenge their students by attempting to convince them of their naivete. Although I am fully aware of the hazards of generalizing from personal experience, until conclusive research evidence is available, we should recognize that there may be a variety of effective teaching devices, of which some obviously will not facilitate winning popularity contests.

The questionnaire should make a distinction between the instructor's ability to present theoretical or abstract materials and descriptive data. The former requires a substantially higher degree of expertise.

The timing of the evaluation is crucial. I feel that the end of the quarter is an extremely poor time to solicit judgements, since it seems probable that they will be influenced by the anxiety generated by preparation for final exams, the expected grade, concern about the consequences of failure--the draft, loss of family status or finances, --etc. A much better time would be at least a month after the course is completed.

I am pleased to note that your proposal recommends submission of the evaluation results to the Departmental Personnel Committee. It seems probable that publishing the results may, at least in certain instances, defeat the purpose of evaluation. A serious loss of respect of both students and colleagues, as a result of the evaluation process, may drive many to seek greener pastures, rather than stimulate them to take the appropriate corrective action.

More important, interpretation of the significance of the evaluation data requires an intimate understanding of the instructor's grading technique, teaching technique, teaching load, experience and interest in the course, personal or family problems, etc. In other words, the data will not have face validity in every instance.

We must be aware of the possibility that the quest for favorable student evaluations might have deleterious effects on the educational process. Vigilance will be required to prevent the relaxation of course requirements, grading standards, etc., as well as the elimination of difficult but valuable concepts and theories, and even the removal of difficult courses and crucial requirements from the curriculum.

The improvement of instruction is vital to the continued development and progress of the University, and providing the above considerations are appropriately handled, student evaluation of instructors can contribute substantially toward the realization of that objective. You may be certain that we will be pleased to assist in any way possible.

- J. From President Doudna, a memorandum covering a copy of thirteen pages of minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Admissions and Records of the Joint Council on Higher Education featuring remarks by Dr. James Holderman of the Higher Board. The discussion reported was wide ranging, but the general theme was that higher education in Illinois will begin to be held more strictly accountable for the resources expended on it in every area.
- K. From President Doudna, a copy of a letter covering a copy of a records depository program for Eastern. Received.
- L. From President Doudna, a memorandum covering a copy of Page 4 of the minutes for the Board of Higher Education's meeting of December 2, 1969. The remarks generally outlined the Board's concern with faculty productivity and efficiency and its intention to investigate these matters further.

NEW BUSINESS:

There was no new business.

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Miss Hieronymus suggested that the Senate decide two questions regarding the proposed constitution for the Faculty Senate: the procedure to be followed after the Senate receives the document and any suggestions in matters of content that the Senate as a body might wish to make to the committee. It was noted that the committee has received some seventeen communications regarding the constitution. It was also noted that at its meeting of November 10, 1969, (Reports, B) the Senate rejected a motion to discuss the final draft of the constitution before it is submitted to the faculty. It was moved (Kluge) and seconded (Holley) to establish the procedure whereby the Senate shall receive the report from the ad hoc committee on the constitution and submit it to the faculty for a vote. The motion carried by a vote of thirteen in favor and one abstention.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m. The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate is on Monday, January 12, from noon to 2 p.m. in the Heritage Room of the University Union.

AGENDA

1. Constitution
2. Evaluation (Visitation)
3. Proposal for Nominations and Elections Procedures
4. Eleven-and-one-half Month Contract (Sabbatical)
5. Selection of President
6. Recognition of Retiring Faculty Members
7. Campus Disorders, Local Policy
8. Scholarships for Children of Deceased Faculty Members
9. Faculty News Sheet (Secretary)
10. Intercultural Council
11. Grievance Committee
12. Proposal for University Government
13. Budget for Higher Education
14. Policy Statements of Higher Board
15. Evaluation of Faculty Research Projects

John H. Keiser
Secretary